A.—Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home and Municipal Administration).—

(*a*) March 1967	...	12
April 1967	...	11
May 1967	...	8
Total	...	31

(*b*) 31
(*c*) 16
(*d*) 7
(*e*) Nil.

Zilla Parishad System in the State.

335. Sri S. CHANDRAKANTH (Bidar).—

Will the Minister for Development and Co-operation be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal to introduce Zilla Parishad system in Mysore State ;

(*b*) if so, where it will be introduced first in the State ?

A.—Sri P. M. NADGOUDA (Minister for Development and Co-operation).—

(*a*) The matter is under consideration of Government.

(*b*) Will arise only when a decision is taken on the matter.

Call Attention to a matter of urgent Public importance.

Sri H. B. JWALANIAH (Hassan).—Sir, I call the attention of the Hon'ble Minister for Food and Civil Supplies to the collection of levy by coercive measures from the raiyats of Karkal Taluk.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food and Civil Supplies).—In response to the Call Attention Notice, I wish to clarify once again, at the outset, that the growers are not harassed in the collection of levy. If specific instances are brought to my notice, I shall undoubtedly, have proper enquiry made and action taken without delay.

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

In the call attention notice it has been stated that the Food Officials and the Tasildar of Karkal Taluk, are forcibly collecting the paddy which is kept for sowing and paying wages for the raiyats of Karkal Taluk, with the help of police.

Except in one case, on no other occasion have the police been used for collection of levy paddy in Karkal Taluk. In the case of one Shri Babu Adhikari of Marna Village, police help was taken as a breach of the peace was apprehended. But as the grower was absent, no seizure was attempted. A special notice was issued on the inmates of the house of the grower and the Food party returned to Headquarters.

During the month of November 1967, the tenants and poor self-cultivating Land holders delivered paddy voluntarily to some extent, but none has delivered the levy paddy in full. After December, the payment of levy voluntarily by the growers stopped and the Food staff had to make house to house visits and collect levy. The cultivators are required to deliver paddy at the appointed Societies, but as they failed to do so, the food party had to visit the houses.

In a number of cases. the growers are hostile to the payment of levy, and as such the food parties have had to argue at length. Such essential administrative firmness when the occasion dictates it, cannot be considered as use of force. Even where they have visited the houses, they have collected only about 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the total demand, using discretion according to the economic circumstances of each case. No doubt, the local officers may have been firm in respect of big cultivators, but no force was used anywhere.

It may be stated here that out of the total demand of 46,000 quintals of paddy for the first crop, the staff were able to collect only about 14,000 quintals. This will go to show that there has been no force, nor is it a fact that paddy kept for seeds and domestic purposes was collected. About 70 to 80 per cent complaints relating to non-compliance with the Levy Order have been referred to the Police, and the Police have probably taken statements from the defaulters in the discharge of their duty.

It is not correct to say that there has been failure of crop in respect of the first crop. Even in respect of the second crop, there has been only a partial failure and the bigger cultivators in particular should be in a position to pay their levy demand. Unfortunately, however, some local anti-social elements have been agitating against the payment of levy.

There has thus been no harassment in connection with the collection of levy paddy in Karkal Taluk during the crop season of 1967–68.